arXiv:1611.02845v1 [stat.ME] 9 Nov 2016

A unit-level small area model with misclassified covariates

Serena Arima*

Sapienza Università di Roma

Silvia Polettini

Sapienza Università di Roma

November 10, 2016

Running headline: Small area model with perturbed covariates

Abstract

Small area models are mixed effects regression models that link the small areas and borrow strength from similar domains. When the auxiliary variables used in the models are measured with error, small area estimators that ignore the measurement error may be worse than direct estimators. Alternative small area estimators accounting for measurement error have been proposed in the literature but only for continuous auxiliary variables. Adopting a Bayesian approach, we extend the unit-level model in order to account for measurement error in both continuous and categorical covariates. For the discrete variables we model the misclassification probabilities and estimate them jointly with all the unknown model parameters. We test our model through a simulation study exploring different scenarios. The impact of the proposed model is emphasized through application to data from the Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey where we focus on the women's malnutrition issue,

*Corresponding author: Serena Arima Dipartimento di metodi e modelli per l'economia, la finanza e il territorio, Sapienza Università di Roma, Via del Castro Laurenziano, 9 00161 Roma, Italia; e-mail: serena.arima@uniroma1.it.

a dramatic problem in developing countries and an important indicator of the socio-economic progress of a country.

Key words: Bayesian hierarchical model, MCMC, measurement error, misclassification matrix, small area estimation.

1 Introduction

Modern small area estimation methods focus on mixed effects regression models that link the small areas and borrow strength from similar domains. However, when the auxiliary variables used in the models are measured with error, small area estimators that ignore such error may be worse than direct estimators (Ybarra and Lohr, 2008; Arima et al., 2015). In regression models, the presence of measurement error in covariates is known to cause biases in estimated model parameters and lead to loss of power for detecting interesting relationships among variables (Carroll et al., 2006). We discuss these issues in the context of unit level small area models, when covariates subject to measurement error are of categorical nature. We propose a unit level measurement error small area model able to deal with categorical covariates as well as continuous covariates. A clear example of the effect of neglecting measurement error and an illustration of the advantages of the proposed procedure arise in the analysis of body mass index (BMI) of Ethiopian women, that we base on 2011 Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) data[1]. BMI is taken as a measure of women's nutritional status. Data on women's nutritional status is essential in monitoring the socio-economic development of a country. Indeed it has a direct impact on women's health status, and several indirect effects through the multiple roles of women in generating income inside and outside the household, bearing children and being responsible of their families' nutrition and care (Black et al., 2008). Not surprisingly, for many coutries this aspect has been the object of prioritized interventions in the achievement of the

[1]Data are collected under the MEASURE DHS project, funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Millennium Development Goals. Although undernutrition has been reduced in recent years, yet, food insecurity remains the greatest challenge in Ethiopia and a serious drawback to the country's economic development; moreover, high regional as well as socio-economic disparities remain. For the above reasons, it would be important to obtain accurate estimates of women's mean BMI levels across domains, first of all those defined by the administrative regions. Although sample sizes in those areas are not as small as in typical small area applications, the proposed small area model applies, since these areas represent unplanned domains for female population. Moreover, the model also allows investigating the role on BMI of a number of socio-economic characteristics such as age, household's wealth index, number of children, and level of educational attainment, while accounting for regional variation, that is large in the country. All of the above variables are clearly potentially explicative of the woman's nutritional status and highlighted as important determinants of undernutrition in previous studies (Bitew and Telake, 2010). However, for some of them it is reasonable to assume that they are measured with error. Our application reveals that, even in the presence of large subsamples, the small area predictions obtained ignoring the measurement error may be misleading and covariates effect may be severely altered.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we briefly review the literature of the measurement error models. In Section 3 we illustrate the small area models that account for measurement error in covariates. In Section 4 we describe the proposed model; Section 5 is devoted to a simulation study that investigate the performance of the proposed model. In Section 6 the model is applied to the Ethiopia DHS data. We conclude with a discussion in Section 7.

2 Measurement error models

Measurement error in covariates is an established and well known problem, and there is an enormous literature on this topic (see, among the others, Fuller, 1987; Carroll et al., 2006). Although measurement error models have been mainly developed for the analysis of experimental data, their role in social studies and, in particular, in official statistics, is crucial. Modern small area

methods heavily rely on the availability of good auxiliary information entering the model in the form of covariates. Such covariates are often estimates obtained by a larger survey, administrative sources, or a previous census; sometimes they arise as the result of field measurement and lab analysis (Ghosh et al., 2006; Buonaccorsi, 2010). As a result, we do not observe the true level of the covariate, but only an estimate. Also, covariates may be self-reported responses (Ybarra and Lohr, 2008), for which under-reporting, lack of memory and digit preference may occur. Under these circumstances, it may be assumed that covariates are measured with error.

The presence of measurement error in covariates causes biases in estimated model parameters and leads to loss of power for detecting interesting relationships among variables. Several solutions exist, also in the small area literature: indeed corrections of the unit-level and area-level estimators have been proposed both in a frequentist and Bayesian context. However, these approaches only deal with continuous covariates measured with error (Ybarra and Lohr, 2008; Datta et al., 2010; Arima et al., 2015).

Most of the measurement error literature relies on the classical measurement error model. It assumes that for each single unit, the covariate X_i $(i = 1, ..., n)$ is not available; instead, we observe k $(k \geq 1)$ replications of measurements of X_i subject to additive error, namely

$$Z_{ij} = X_i + U_{ij} \quad j = 1, ..., k \tag{1}$$

where U_{ij}'s are independent and identically distributed variables with zero mean. The X_i's might be either unknown, fixed, quantities or random variables. In the first case, the measurement error is called functional whereas in the second case it is defined as structural.

Model in equation (1) assumes that the mismeasured covariates are continuously distributed. For discrete covariates, measurement error means misclassification. Examples abound: item preference for privacy or social desirability reasons, digit preference and recall errors are common sources of misclassification; the discretized version of a continuous covariate measured with error is also subject to misclassification. Also, misclassification error may be artificially included for

disclosure limitation purposes by National Statistical Offices (Gouweleeuw *et al.*, 1998; Polettini and Arima, 2015).

In this case, the measurement error model is defined in terms of misclassification probabilities. Consider a variable X assuming K possible values, and denote the perturbed observed variable by Z. The misclassification model can be parametrized through the misclassification probabilities for each category, defined as:

$$p_{k'k} = P(Z = k|X = k') \quad k', k = 1, \ldots, K \tag{2}$$

So $p_{k'k}$ represents the probability of observing category k of Z for a record having the k'-th category of the unobservable variable X. The misclassification probabilities are collected into a $K \times K$ misclassification matrix P whose diagonal elements p_{jj} $(j = 1, ..., K)$ are the probabilities that no measurement error occurs for the j-th category of X.

In the context of classical measurement error in covariates, the regression model defined in terms of the unobservable true covariate X is supplemented by the misclassification model for Z given X, and then by a model for X:

$$\sum_{k',k} P(Y = y|X = K, \mathcal{B})P(Z = k|X = k')P(X = k') \tag{3}$$

where summation is done over all possible combinations of levels of (X, Z) and $\mathcal{B}$ is the vector of the regression parameters. For each addend in (3), the first component defines the underlying outcome model; the second one defines the error model for Z given the true covariates and the last term defines the distribution of the true covariate. This latter component is responsible for almost all the practical problems of implementation and model selection when the maximum likelihood method is employed. In the case of binary misclassified covariates, the maximum likelihood approach is relatively straightforward. For the general case ($K > 2$), Küchenhoff et al. (2006) developed a general method, called MC-SIMEX, that corrects bias of model estimates

when discrete covariates are misclassified. Application to mixed effects models is discussed in Slate and Bandyopadhyay (2009), who investigate the performance of MC-SIMEX under a model with a discrete predictor measured with error and censored Gaussian responses. Their simulation study shows that even with the adjustment for bias allowed by the MC-SIMEX algorithm, considerable bias remains even with small misclassification probabilities. An important drawback of the method is that knowledge of the transition matrix P is required. Excluding situations in which covariates are perturbed on purpose for confidentiality reasons, this assumption is often unrealistic also in a small area context.

3 Measurement error small area models

Models that are commonly used to derive small area estimators can be classified into two groups: area level models and unit level models. Area level models relate the small area means to area-specific auxiliary variables. Such models are essential if unit level data are not available. Unit level models relate the unit values of the study variable to unit-specific auxiliary variables with known area means. In this paper we focus on unit-level models within a Bayesian framework. See Rao and Molina (2015) for an up-to-date review.

Suppose there are m areas and let N_i be the known population size of area i. We denote by Y_{ij} the response of the $j-$th unit in the $i-$th area ($i = 1, ..., m$; $j = 1, ..., N_i$). A random sample of size n_i is drawn from the $i-$th area. The goal is to predict the small area means $\bar{Y}_i = \frac{1}{N_i}\sum_{i=1}^{N_i} y_{ij}$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, based on the available data. To develop reliable estimates, auxiliary information is introduced as covariates. Ghosh et al. (2006) and Ghosh and Sinha (2007) were the first to consider the problem of measurement error in small area models for unit-level data. Adopting a superpopulation approach to finite population sampling, they model the response variable Y as

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha + \beta x_i + u_i + \epsilon_{ij} \qquad i = 1, ..., m; \quad j = 1, ..., N_i \tag{4}$$

where x_i is an auxiliary variable observed for each area. ϵ_{ij} and u_i are assumed independent, $\epsilon_{ij} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_e^2)$ and $u_i \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_u^2)$. To measure the true area-level covariate it is assumed that there are R_i units in the $i-$th small area and that a random sample of size r_i is taken from the $i-$th area, resulting in data X_{il} $(l = 1, .., r_i; i = 1, ..., m)$. For the sample, the measurement error model

$$X_{il} = x_i + \eta_{il}, \qquad \eta_{ij} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\eta^2) \qquad i = 1, ..., m; \quad l = 1, ..., r_i \tag{5}$$

is assumed. Furthermore, ϵ_{ij}, u_i and η_{ij} are taken mutually independent. The model described in Equations (4) and (5) reduces to the one described in Ghosh et al. (2006) when $R_i = N_i$ and $r_i = n_i$. Ghosh et al. (2006) also assumed that $x_i \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\mu_x, \sigma_x^2)$, defining the structural measurement error model. They considered both an empirical Bayes and a hierarchical Bayes approach to derive predictors of small area means θ_i. Under their empirical Bayes approach, Ghosh et al. (2006) first derived a predictor for the vector of $N_i - n_i$ units, conditional on the unknown parameters and the observed sample, denoted as $Y^{(1)}$. In particular, for any unsampled Y_{ij}, $j = n_i + 1, ..., N_i$, they obtained

$$E[Y_{ij}|Y^{(1)}, \beta, \alpha, \sigma_e^2, \sigma_u^2, \mu_x, \sigma_x^2, \sigma_\eta^2] = (1 - B_i)\bar{Y}_i + B_i(\alpha + \beta\mu_x)$$

where $B_i = \sigma_e^2/[\sigma_e^2 + n_i(\sigma_u^2 + \beta^2\sigma_x^2)]$. The empirical Bayes predictor is obtained by replacing the unknown model parameters with their estimators. Torabi et al. (2009) extended the approach in Ghosh et al. (2006) including sample information on the covariate values. Ghosh et al. (2006) also proposed a fully Bayesian approach; they define a hierarchical model based on equations (4) and (5), specify vague prior distributions for all the model parameters, and estimate posterior distributions via Gibbs sampling. Arima et al. (2012) extended the above approach, proposing to use the Jeffreys' prior on the model parameters.

The aforementioned literature considers the case in which the measurement error affects only continuous variables, according to the measurement error model of equation (4). To allow for

auxiliary discrete covariates measured with error, we build on the model proposed in Ghosh et al. (2006). In particular, we model the misclassification mechanism through an unknown transition matrix P and estimate all the unknown parameters in a fully Bayesian framework.

4 The proposed model

Consider a finite population, whose units are divided into m small areas. As in the previous section, let Y_{ij} be the value of the variable of interest associated with the j-th unit in the $i-$th area and let the sample data be denoted by y_{ij}, $i = 1, \ldots, m$; $j = 1, \ldots, n_i$. For each area, we consider the following covariates: t_{ij} – the vector of p continuous or discrete covariates measured without error, w_{ij} and x_{ij} – respectively, a vector of q continuous covariates and h discrete variables (with a total of K categories), both measured with error. Denote by s_{ij} and z_{ij} the observed values of the latent w_{ij} and x_{ij}, respectively. We assume that the perturbation only depends on the unobserved category of the latent variable, so if $h > 1$ we assume independent misclassification. Without loss of generality, in what follows we assume $h = 1$.

Following the notation in Ghosh et al. (2006), the proposed measurement error model can be written in the usual multi-stage way: for $j = 1, \ldots, n_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and for $k, k' = 1, \ldots, K$

Stage 1. $y_{ij} = \theta_{ij} + e_{ij}$ $\qquad$ $e_{ij} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_e^2)$

Stage 2. $\theta_{ij} = t_{ij}^{'}\delta + w_{ij}^{'}\gamma + \sum_{k=1}^{K} I(x_{ij} = k)\beta_k + u_i$ $\qquad$ $u_i \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_u^2)$

Stage 3. $S_{ij}|w_{ij} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(w_{ij}, \sigma_s^2)$, $\qquad$ $W_{ij} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_w^2)$

$Pr(Z_{ij} = k|X_{ij} = k') = p_{k'k}$ $\qquad$ $p_{k'.} \sim Dir(\alpha_{k',1}, \ldots, \alpha_{k',K})$

$Pr(X_{ij} = k') = \dfrac{1}{K}$

Stage 4. $\beta, \delta, \gamma, \sigma_e^2, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_s^2$ are, loosely speaking, a -priori mutually independent.

Stage 3 defines the measurement error model for both continuous and discrete covariates: we

assume that the continuous observable covariates S_{ij} are modeled as Gaussian variables centered at the true unobservable value w_{ij} with variability σ_s^2. The model for the unobservable continuous variables W_{ij} is assumed normal with known variance; without loss of generality, we work with centered covariates, so that we can take $E(W_{ij}) = 0$.

For the discrete covariates, the misclassification mechanism is specified according to the $K \times K$ matrix P, whose (k', k) element, $p_{k'k}$, denotes the probability that the observable variable Z_{ij} takes the $k-$th category when the true unobservable variable X_{ij} takes the $k'-$th category. We also assume that the misclassification probabilities are the same across subjects and that all the categories have the same prior probability $\frac{1}{K}$ to occur. Row-wise, P contains the conditional distributions of Z for the K different values of X. We denote by $p_{k'.}$ the $k'-$th row of P, whose entries represent the probabilities $P(Z_{ij} = k|X_ij = k')$, $k = 1, \ldots K$. Over each $p_{k'.}$, $k' = 1, \ldots, K$, we place a Dirichlet $Dir(\alpha_{k',1}, \ldots, \alpha_{k',K})$ prior distribution, with known $\alpha_{k',1}, \ldots, \alpha_{k',K}$.

In Stage 4 we assume $\beta \sim N(\mu_\beta, \Sigma_\beta = diag(\sigma_\beta^2))$, $\delta \sim N(\mu_\delta, \Sigma_\delta = diag(\sigma_\delta))$, $\gamma \sim N(\mu_\gamma, \Sigma_\gamma = diag(\sigma_\gamma))$, $\sigma_u^{-2} \sim Gamma(a_u, b_u)$, $\sigma_e^{-2} \sim Gamma(a_e, b_e)$, $\sigma_s^{-2} \sim Gamma(a_s, b_s)$. Hyperparameters have been chosen to have flat priors. Finally, we assume σ_w^2 and $(\alpha_{k',1}, \ldots, \alpha_{k',K})$ known.

According to the above assumptions, we can estimate the transition matrix P jointly with all the other model parameters. In some particular instances, like the Post Randomization Method in disclosure limitation described in Gouweleeuw *et al.* (1998), P might be completely known. In that case the model may be simplified to avoid the unnecessary estimation of the elements of P.

Finally, we denote by $\Omega = (\beta, \delta, \gamma, \sigma_e^2, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_s^2, P, x, w)$ the vector of the unknown parameters.

The likelihood function is defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&L(\Omega; y, z, w) = \\
&= \sum_{k'=1}^{K} \frac{p_{k'k}}{K} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_e^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_e^2} \left(y_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} I(z_{ij} = k)\beta_k - t_{ij}^{'}\delta - s_{ij}^{'}\gamma - u_i \right)^2 \right) \\
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_s^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_s^2} (s_{ij} - w_{ij})^2 \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_u^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_u^2} u_i^2 \right)
\end{aligned}
$$

According to the Bayes theorem, the posterior distribution of Ω is proportional to the product of the likelihood above and the prior distributions specified in Stage 4. As the posterior distribution cannot be derived analytically in closed form, we obtain samples from the posterior distribution using Gibbs sampling. Full conditional distributions to implement the Gibbs sampler are provided in the following subsection. Under the specified model, small area means can be estimated according to the posterior predictive distribution of

$$\theta_i = \sum_{k=1}^{K} F_{ik}\beta_k + \bar{T}_i^{'}\delta + \bar{S}_i^{'}\gamma \tag{6}$$

where F_{ik}, $\bar{T}_i^{'}$ and $S_i^{'}$ are the relative frequency of the $k-$th category of Z and the covariate means in the $i-th$ area of the population, respectively. The MCMC output is exploited to estimate θ_i, $i = 1, \ldots m$ in equation (6).

4.1 Computational issues

The Gibbs sampler requires drawing from the full conditional distributions of each $\beta, \delta, \gamma, \sigma_e^2, \sigma_u^2, P, x_{ij}, w_{ij}$ given the remaining parameters and the data. The full conditional distributions are specified in the next equations. Note that for the discrete variable(s) we adopt an Anova-type parametrization, denoting by $\mathbf{X}$ the $K \times \sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i$ design matrix induced by the categorical variable(s); the intercept is not included in the model.

(i) $x_{ij}|\cdot \sim Multinomial(p_1, ..., p_K)$ where

$p_k = Pr(x_{ij} = k|\cdot) = p_{k,z_{ij}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_e^2}(y_{ij} - \beta_k - t'_{ij}\delta - w'_{ij}\gamma - u_i)^2\right)$

(ii) $\beta|\cdot \sim N\left(\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{I}{\sigma_\beta^2}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}'(y - T\delta - W\gamma - u)}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{\mu_\beta}{\sigma_\beta^2}\right); \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{I}{\sigma_\beta^2}\right)^{-1}\right)$

(iii) $\delta|\cdot \sim N\left(\left(\frac{T'T}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{I}{\sigma_\delta^2}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{T'(y - \mathbf{X}\beta - W\gamma - u)}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{\mu_\delta}{\sigma_\delta^2}\right); \left(\frac{T'T}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{I}{\sigma_\delta^2}\right)^{-1}\right)$

(iv) $\gamma|\cdot \sim N\left(\left(\frac{W'W}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{I}{\sigma_\gamma^2}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{W'(y - \mathbf{X}\beta - T\delta - u)}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{\mu_\gamma}{\sigma_\gamma^2}\right); \left(\frac{W'W}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{I}{\sigma_\gamma^2}\right)^{-1}\right)$

(v) $w_{ij}|\cdot \sim N\left(\left(\frac{\gamma\gamma'}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_w^2}\right)^{-1}\left(\gamma\frac{y_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^K I(x_{ij}=k)\beta_k - t'_{ij}\delta - w'_{ij}\gamma - u_i}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{s_{ij}}{\sigma_w^2}\right), \left(\frac{\gamma\gamma'}{\sigma_e^2} + \frac{I}{\sigma_w^2}\right)^{-1}\right)$

(vi) $\sigma_e^{-2}|\cdot \sim Gamma\left(a_e + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m n_i}{2}, b_e + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i}(y_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^K I(x_{ij}=k)\beta_k - t'_{ij}\delta + w'_{ij}\gamma - u_i)^2}{2}\right)$

(vii) $\sigma_u^{-2}|\cdot \sim Gamma\left(a_u + \frac{m}{2}, b_u + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2}{2}\right)$

(viii) $\sigma_s^{-2}|\cdot \sim Gamma\left(a_s + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m n_i}{2}, b_s + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i}(s_{ij} - w_{ij})^2}{2}\right)$.

(ix) $u_i|\cdot \sim N\left(\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_u^2} + \frac{n_i}{\sigma_e^2}\right)^{-1}\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}(y_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^K I(x_{ij}=k)\beta_k - t'_{ij}\delta - w'_{ij}\gamma)}{\sigma_e^2}, \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_u^2} + \frac{n_i}{\sigma_e^2}\right)^{-1}\right)$

(x) $p_{k'\cdot} = (p_{k'1}, \ldots, p_{k'K})|\cdot \sim Dir(\alpha_{k',1} + \nu_{1,k'}, \ldots, \alpha_{k',K} + \nu_{K,k'})$, $k' = 1, \ldots, K$, where $\nu_{k,k'}$ is the number of occurrences such that $(z = k, x = k')$, for each $k = 1, \ldots, K$.

Model estimation has been implemented in the R environment (R Core Team, 2015). The code is available on request.

5 Simulation study

In order to assess the performance of the proposed model in terms of parameter estimates, we conducted a simulation study in which we generate latent data and then perturb it according to different scenarios, as described next.

Our reference model, defined in terms of a single unobservable categorical covariate, is the following:

$$y_{ij} = \theta_{ij} + e_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} I(x_{ij} = k)\beta_k + u_i + e_{ij},\ j = 1, \ldots, n_i;\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{7}$$

with normal errors. The number of areas was set to $m = 20$; the number of observations per area is random, with n_i ranging from 3 to 50. We generated 50 replicated samples from model (7) above, defining the underlying, unobservable data. For each sample, the actual observations were obtained by perturbing the original categories of X through a diagonal transition matrix P with diagonal entries $p_{kk} = p$ and uniform off-diagonal entries. To investigate the effect of the misclassification, four levels of perturbation were set: $p = (0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8)$. Following the simulation scheme in Ghosh et al. (2006) and Torabi et al. (2009), for $K = 3$ we set $\sigma_e^2 = 100$, $\sigma_u^2 = 16$ and regression parameter $\beta = (50, 5, -10)$

We set $\mu_\beta, \mu_\delta, \mu_\gamma$ equal to zero and $a_u, b_u, a_e, b_e, a_s, b_s$ all equal to 0.001; we also set $\alpha_{k,k} = 0.5; \alpha_{k,k-1} = \alpha_{k,k+1} = 0.2$ $(k = 1, \ldots, K)$, with uniform transition probabilities on the remaining categories.

For each simulated data and for each model, we generate 10^4 Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations, discarding the first half and then thinning the chains by taking one out of every 10 sampled values.

We compare the proposed model, denoted by M_{Prop}, with the model M_{True} that uses the true categories; in order to quantify the effect of ignoring the unknown misclassification mechanism, we also estimate the "naive" model M_{Naive} that ignores the measurement error and uses the perturbed categories as if they were correct. We focus on estimation of the model parameters $\beta, \sigma_e^2, \sigma_u^2$ and on the model's ability at reconstructing the true categories of X. We also compare the predictions of the small area means θ_i under each competing model. Table 1 shows the results of the simulations. For each model and for each parameter, we show the posterior mean, the relative bias (RB), the relative mean squared error (RMSE) and credibility interval coverage averaged over the 50 datasets. Notice that when the misclassification probability is relatively small ($p = 0.8$ and $p = 0.7$), the proposed model behaves very similarly to the model involving the true covariates in terms of both bias and MSE of the estimates. As expected, increasing the misclassification probability, the estimates obtained with the proposed model are more biased

Table 1: Simulation study: for each model parameter, the table reports the posterior mean, bias, mse and credible interval coverage at different levels of perturbation and for the three models considered. All the quantities are averaged over 50 datasets. In this simulation we set $K = 3$. $\beta = (50, 5, -10)$, $\sigma_e^2 = 100$, $\sigma_u^2 = 16$.

		M_{True}				M_{Prop}				M_{Naive}			
p		Est	RB	RMSE	Cov	Est	RB	RMSE	Cov	Est	RB	RMSE	Cov
0.5	β_1	49.61	-0.01	0.00	1.00	49.28	-0.01	0.00	1.00	34.08	-0.32	0.10	0.00
	β_2	4.59	-0.08	0.10	1.00	2.48	-1.50	1.17	0.65	2.47	-0.51	0.55	0.90
	β_3	-10.05	0.01	0.02	1.00	-3.35	-0.67	0.69	0.75	12.51	-2.25	5.13	0.00
	σ_e^2	102.02	0.02	0.01	0.85	125.69	0.26	0.11	0.55	609.21	5.09	26.15	0.00
	σ_u^2	19.28	0.20	0.47	1.00	17.83	0.11	0.57	0.95	17.11	0.07	1.90	0.9
0.6	β_1	49.59	-0.01	0.00	1.00	49.29	-0.01	0.00	1.00	36.63	-0.27	0.08	0.00
	β_2	4.74	-0.05	0.09	1.00	4.02	-0.80	1.12	0.75	4.49	-0.10	0.23	1.00
	β_3	-9.84	-0.02	0.02	1.00	-6.58	-0.34	0.24	0.70	8.37	-1.84	3.44	0.00
	σ_e^2	101.39	0.01	0.01	1.00	120.89	0.21	0.07	0.65	562.60	4.63	21.66	0.00
	σ_u^2	15.95	-0.00	0.29	1.00	15.16	-0.05	0.32	1.00	13.96	-0.13	1.25	0.80
0.7	β_1	50.67	0.01	0.00	1.00	50.51	0.01	0.00	1.00	38.64	-0.23	0.06	0.00
	β_2	5.53	0.11	0.10	0.95	4.11	-0.18	0.28	0.85	6.93	0.39	0.38	0.90
	β_3	-10.01	0.00	0.02	1.00	-8.54	-0.15	0.08	0.80	4.04	-1.40	2.04	0.00
	σ_e^2	99.71	-0.00	0.01	0.95	112.47	0.12	0.05	0.65	531.43	4.31	18.79	0.00
	σ_u^2	17.31	0.08	0.31	0.95	16.91	0.06	0.40	0.95	14.57	-0.09	1.30	0.80
0.8	β_1	49.00	-0.02	0.00	0.95	48.75	-0.03	0.00	0.90	38.63	-0.23	0.06	0.00
	β_2	5.99	-0.20	0.12	1.00	2.70	-0.46	0.23	0.85	6.58	0.32	0.30	0.85
	β_3	-11.21	0.12	0.04	1.00	-9.89	-0.01	0.03	0.95	-3.56	-0.64	0.49	0.10
	σ_e^2	100.83	0.01	0.01	0.95	114.02	0.14	0.04	0.85	432.58	3.33	11.36	0.00
	σ_u^2	18.23	0.14	0.43	1.00	17.82	0.11	0.40	1.00	15.12	-0.06	1.00	0.90

and show larger variability, but the coverage of the credible interval is still acceptable. On the other hand, ignoring the perturbation has a significant effect on the estimates even when the probability of perturbation is small: increasing the perturbation, the variability of the estimates rapidly increases and so does the bias; by consequence, the credible intervals coverage is very low. As noticed in Arima et al. (2015), measurement error in covariates introcudes a sort of borrowing bias, which contrasts with the usual borrowing strength from the auxiliary information, typical of hierarchical models.

Table 3 shows the RMSEs (multiplied by 100) of the small area predictions. As expected,

the proposed model performs very similarly to the model involving the true covariates when the misclassification probability is low. When p decreases, the small area prediction errors increase but they are much smaller than those produced by the model ignoring the ME. With respect to the credible interval coverage, the proposed model produced credible intervals with coverage close to the nominal coverage level (95%) even for large misclassification errors.

In some applications, it might be of interest to recover the original, unobserved, variable scores. For p increasing from 0.5 to 0.8, the proportion of the true categories correctly inferred by the proposed model is equal to $0.705, 0.756, 0.832$ and 0.896: the information conveyed by the auxiliary variables allows to correctly reconstruct a proportion of x_{ij}s that is even larger than prescribed by the perturbation probability.

6 Ethiopia DHS data application

We consider data from the 2011 Ethiopia DHS, a nationally representative survey of 16,515 women aged 15-49 and 14,110 men aged 15-59. Data are available at `www.measuredhs.com`. The survey was designed to provide population and health indicators at the national (urban and rural) and regional levels (nine regional states, namely Tigray, Affar, Amhara, Oromiya, Somali, Benishangul-Gumuz, SNNP, Gambela, Harari, and two city administrations, Addis Ababa and Dire-Dawa); the latter represent the 11 domains of interest in our application. Ethiopia is the second most populated country in Sub-Saharan Africa, with over 96 millions of inhabitants in 2014. Complete survey data were available for a total of $\sum_i n_i = 15515$ women, with n_i ranging from 813 (Somali) to 2066 (Oromiya). Such sample sizes, although not typical of small area applications, should be considered in light of the total population and of the strong geographical variability; moreover these regions represent unplanned domains for female population. For the above reasons, the problem might be framed within a small area estimation context.

We considered women's body mass index (BMI) (kg/m2) as a measure of women's nutritional status; women with a BMI<18.5 are considered to be at risk of chronic energy deficiency. A BMI

below 17 kg/m2 indicates severe undernutrition and is associated with increased mortality. DHS figures for 2011 indicate that 27% of Ethiopian women in reproductive age were at chronic energy deficiency risk, the highest levels of undernutrition occurring in Tigray, Affar, Gambela and Somali. These represent the poorest rural areas, characterized by high incidence of infectious diseases, low access to improved water sources, high exposure to natural hazards, scattered health service provisions and, finally, lack of access to education and early marriage for women. The latter remain the determinants of rural-urban disparities in nutrition and health conditions.

Bitew and Telake (2010) employed a logistic regression to identify the determinants of women's chronic energy deficiency based on Ethiopia DHS data from 2000 and 2005. They investigated age, marital status, religion, occupation, education, wealth index (a composite measure of a household's cumulative living standard), and region of residence as potential determinants of women's undernutrition. They highlighted rural-urban and regional disparities in women's nutritional status. Tebekaw (2011) analyzed Ethiopia 2000, 2005 and 2011 DHS data with focus on underweight and overweight in Addis Ababa. They used a logistic regression model to estimate the strength of association between women underweight status and demographic and socio-economic variables. They concluded that women's age and proxies of socio-economic status (i.e. household wealth index quintile, educational attainment) were positively associated with being underweight. Noticing a persisting social male dominance in Ethiopia, Tebekaw et al. (2014) investigated the link between malnutrition and women's social role based on the 2000 Ethiopia DHS data. Woman empowerment was captured by several DHS variables regarding women's participation in specific household's decisions; other proxies for women's decision-making autonomy were educational attainment, occupational status, and household property possessions. Women's decision-making autonomy was found to be one of the most important determinants of malnutrition, whereas not significant effects for most of the proxy variables were obtained. The literature just described employed standard logistic regression models. Being interested in investigating the possible regional differences in BMI levels, we consider a unit-level small area

model with area-specific random effects. The model exploits the relationship between women's BMI and the following covariates: area of residence (urban vs rural centres), wealth index, education, and age. We notice that the wealth index is built on the survey data through a complex procedure which makes it a variable subject to several sources of error. The wealth index is built from from sample information on asset ownership, housing characteristics and water and sanitation facilities; it is obtained via a three-step procedure, based on principal components analysis, designed to take better account of urban-rural differences in scores and indicators of wealth (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004; Central Statistical Agency and ICF International, 2012). National-level wealth quintiles (from lowest to highest) are obtained by assigning the household score to each *de jure* household member, ranking each person in the population by his or her score, and then dividing the ranking into five equal categories, each comprising 20 percent of the population. By consequence, we treat the wealth index quintile as a categorical covariate subject to misclassification. Among regions, the wealth quintile distribution varies greatly. A relatively high percentage of the population in the most urbanized regions is in the highest wealth quintile, while a significant proportion of the population in the more rural regions is in the lowest wealth quintile, as in Affar (57 percent), Somali (44 percent), and Gambela (35 percent).

We also consider age, being self reported, as a continuous variable observed with error.

To accommodate error in variables we apply the methodology described in Section 4. Our aim is to investigate the effect of neglecting measurement error in both categorical and continuous covariates on the assessment of the regression effects and on the prediction of area-specific BMI mean levels. In order to assess the efect of measurement error, we estimate the proposed model, along with its no-measurement-error counterpart. We assume that all the regression effects have zero a priori mean and set $a_u, b_u, a_e, b_e, a_s, b_s$ equal to 0.001; moreover we specify $\sigma_w^2 = 1$ and $\alpha_{k,k} = 0.5; \alpha_{k,k-1} = \alpha_{k,k+1} = 0.2$ $(k = 1, \ldots, K)$, with uniform transition probabilities on the remaining categories. For each model, we generate 10^4 Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations, discarding the first half and then thinning the chains by taking one out of every 10 sampled

values. Chain convergence has been monitored by visual inspection using standard convergence diagnostic tools, such as trace plots and autocorrelation plots.

We begin with an inspection of estimates of the regression parameters obtained under the two models, with and without accounting for measurement error. Indeed, as highlighted by the simulation study, inaccurate estimation of regression coefficients may affect small area predictions. The posterior distribution of the regression parameters under both models are reported in Figure 1. Under the measurement error model (top panel), the covariates' effects are all consistent with expectations. The BMI increases with the wealth index category, so that the poorest women are more likely to be underweight than the richest ones. Although expected, such an important effect of the wealth index has not been always confirmed in previous studies. Also, education significantly impacts on the BMI, since more educated women show a larger BMI than less educated ones. The model also highlights the great disparity between urban and rural areas, where the women's undernutrition problem is more severe. The number of children ever born (parity) is another factor found to significantly affect women's nutritional status. The BMI decreases with parity, which means that the risk of underweight increases with the number of children. With respect to age, the model highlights positive linear association with BMI: younger women are more likely to be underweight than older ones. This fact is already documented in the literature and quite expected since adolescent women are at more at risk of problematic first birth (the mean age at first birth is 19.6), HIV infection, illegal abortion, all related to BMI through the health condition.

Noticeably, under the model that ignores the measurement error in wealth index and age, the strong differential effect of the wealth index disappears (see the bottom panel of Figure 1). This is also consistent with findings in the literature, that sporadically identifies this variable's importance. With respect to the other parameters, while the meaning of the coefficients is coherent with those obtained with the proposed model, the variables' effect is considerably inflated.

Given the strong effect of neglecting the measurement error in model estimation, we expect



Figure 1: Ethiopia data: posterior distributions of the model parameters under the proposed model, P unknown (top panel) and under the assumption that the covariates are measured without error (bottom panel). In the left panels, we show the posterior distribution of the parameter β of the wealth index. In the right panels we present the posterior distribution of all the other regression parameters.

Table 2: Posterior mean and standard deviation (in brackets) of the misclassification matrix P.

k	1	2	3	4	5
1	0.231 (0.004)	0.150 (0.003)	0.140 (0.003)	0.154 (0.003)	0.325 (0.004)
2	0.056 (0.064)	0.800 (0.242)	0.055 (0.137)	0.041 (0.110)	0.048 (0.167)
3	0.048 (0.134)	0.051 (0.118)	0.799 (0.240)	0.056 (0.117)	0.046 (0.122)
4	0.052 (0.199)	0.042 (0.115)	0.040 (0.075)	0.824 (0.306)	0.042 (0.239)
5	0.025 (0.090)	0.020 (0.047)	0.023 (0.017)	0.016 (0.127)	0.916 (0.157)

that small area predictions may differ considerably among models. The left panel of Figure 2 shows the posterior distribution of the small area BMI means under the proposed model (left panel) and under the model that neglects measurement error (right panel). Under the proposed model, the geographical pattern is coherent with expectations: Addis Ababa, Harari and Dire Dawa show larger mean body mass index compared with all the other regions, that show very similar BMI distribution. Indeed, as noticed in Central Statistical Agency and ICF International (2012), women in Tigray, Affar, Somali, Gambela and Ben-Gumuz were highly likely to be undernourished. In these regions more than one-third of women experience undernutrition. On the other hand, small area means shown in the right of Figure 2 do not reflect the geography, with even a reversal in the ranking of areas. Moreover, the latter estimates show a much stronger variation, resulting from inflation of model's parameters, that is not apparent under the proposed model. Although exhibiting a much reduced intra-regional variation, mean BMI area predictions under the proposed model are coherent with the direct estimates and with the anticipated rural-urban disparities, as shown in Figure3. In conclusion, the application reveals that not accounting for measurement error may lead to misrepresentation of variable's effects and overestimation of area figures, even in cases when the sample information is strong and the model should agree with the direct estimates.

Table 2 shows posterior mean and posterior standard deviation of the misclassification probabilities for the wealth index. Notice that the transition matrix differs considerably from the prior specification and that changes are expected to occur essentially only for units with the lowest category of that variable.



Figure 2: Posterior distributions of the small area means for the Ethiopia data. In the left panel, we show the estimates obtained with the proposed model; in the right panel, the small area means obtained with the model ignoring the measurement error.



Figure 3: Model-based small area mean estimates versus direct estimates.

7 Discussion

In this paper, building on Ghosh et al. (2006), we have proposed a Bayesian unit level small area model that accounts for misclassification in categorical variables and allows for unknown perturbation mechanism. We investigated the performance of the proposed model in estimating the regression parameters and predicting the small area means based on a simulated and real data. We focused on Ethiopia DHS data to study the effect over women's body mass index of several social and demographic variables; random effects specified at the area level allow us to account for possible regional differences in the distribution of BMI. Other proposals in the literature, most notably MC-SIMEX (Küchenhoff et al., 2006), address the issue of misclassification in covariates. Our proposal offers the advantage to allow for unknown perturbation matrix P, that is estimated jointly with all the unknown model's parameters.

Based on simulated data, we also study the model capability in reconstructing the true value of the perturbed variables for each unit. Under the assumption of unknown transition matrix P, our model is not only able to reduce the estimation bias, but also to recover a large fraction of the original scores for the misclassified variables.

Interestingly in our application, when measurement error is not accounted for by the model, the importance of the wealth index is masked by other variables' effect; the wealth index has been documented in the literature as a meaningful measure of socio-economic status, household food security and disposable income available for food (Corsi et al., 2011). Moreover, the ranking of areas is not meaningful when error in covariates is neglected. Besides a strong effect of the socio-economic status, the results obtained under the proposed model reflect a noticeable rural-urban disparity and an effect of parity and age on the BMI level. Once adjusting for individual and area-level covariates, regional disparities remain.

Our results indicate that variable weights and regression effects may be severely affected by neglecting the presence of errors in covariates; we also conclude that model selection may be affected when measurement error in covariates is not properly accounted for by the model.

Moreover, area effect appear to change when measurement error is neglected, which is a very important aspect in small area estimation.

Defining BMI as a categorical outcome (underweight, normal, overweight), Corsi et al. (2011) used a Bayesian multinomial logistic regression to assess the socio-economic and geographic patterning of underweight and overweight in the population; to investigate the existence of a neighbourhood effect they include random effects defined at the neighbourhood level. While the authors can address both issues of under- and over-nutrition, their model does not account for measurement error. Our model could also be extended to a generalized linear regression framework to allow for measurement error in covariates. Moreover, a large variation can be expected for the BMI within regions; at the same time, under the proposed model we observe clusters of areas with similar BMI means. This suggests that spatial effects could also be included in the model. These aspects will be the subject of further research.

References

Arima, S., Datta, G.S. and Liseo, B. (2012) Objective Bayesian analysis of a measurement error small area model. *Bayesian Analysis*, **72 (2)**,363–384

Arima, S., Datta, G.S. and Liseo, B. (2015) Bayesian Estimators for Small Area Models when Auxiliary Information is Measured with Error. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **42 (2)**,518–529

Bitew, F. H. and Telake, D. S. (2010) Undernutrition among Women in Ethiopia: Rural-Urban Disparity. DHS Working Papers No. 77. Calverton, Maryland, USA: ICF Macro.

Black, R. E., Allen, L. H., Bhutta, Z. A., Caulfield, L. E., de Onis, M., Ezzati, M., Mathers, C., and Rivera, J. (2008) Maternal and child undernutrition: global and regional exposures and health consequences. *The Lancet*, **371**(9608), pp.243–260.

Buonaccorsi, J.P. (2010) *Measurement error: models, methods and applications*. Chapman & Hall, CRC.

Carroll, R.J., Ruppert, D., Stefanski, L. and Crainiceanu, C. (2006) *Measurement error in nonlinear models: a modern perspective*. 2nd edn. Chapman & Hall, CRC.

Central Statistical Agency [Ethiopia] and ICF International (2012). Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey 2011. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and Calverton, Maryland, USA: Central Statistical Agency and ICF International.

Corsi, D. J., Kyu, H. H., and Subramanian, S. V. (2011). Socioeconomic and geographic patterning of under- and overnutrition among women in Bangladesh. *The Journal of Nutrition*, **141**(4), pp.631–638.

Datta, G.S., Rao, J.N.K. and Torabi, M. (2010) Pseudo-empirical Bayes estimation of small area means under a nested error linear regression model with functional measurement errors. *Journal of Statistical Planning Inference*, **140 (11)**, 2952–2962.

Fuller, W.A. (1987) *Measurement error models*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Ghosh, M., Sinha, K. and Kim, D. (2006) Empirical and Hierarchical Bayesian estimation in finite population sampling under structural measurement error model. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **33(3)**,591.0-568.

Ghosh, M. and Sinha, K. (2007) Empirical Bayes estimation in finite population sampling under functional measurement error models. *Journal of Statistical Planning Inference*, **137**, 2759–2773.

Gouweleeuw, J., Kooiman, P., Willenborg, L. and De Wolf, P.-P. (1998). Post randomisation for statistical disclosure control: Theory and implementation. Journal of Official Statistics, **1**4, pp. 463–478.

Küchenhoff, H., Mwalili, S.M. and Lesaffre, E. (2006) A general method for dealing with misclassification in regression: The misclassification SIMEX. *Biometrics*, **62(1)**, 85–96.

Polettini, S. and Arima, S. (2015) Small area estimation with covariates perturbed for disclosure limitation. *Statistica*, **25 (1)**, 57–72.

R Core Team (2015) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, *Foundation*

for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, http://www.R-project.org/.

Rao, J.N.K. and Molina, I. (2015) Small Area Estimation, 2nd Edition, Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey.

Rutstein, S. O. and Johnson, K. (2004). The Wealth Index. DHS Comparative Reports No. 6. Calverton, Maryland: ORC Macro.

Slate, E.H. and Bandyopadhyay, D. (2009) An investigation of the MC-SIMEX method with application to measurement error in periodontal outcomes. *Statistics in Medicine*, **28**, 3523–3538.

Tebekaw, Y. (2011). Women's decision-making autonomy and their nutritional status in ethiopia: Socio-cultural linking of two MDGs. In Teller, C., editor, *The Demographic Transition and Development in Africa: The Unique Case of Ethiopia*, pages 105–124. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.

Tebekaw, Y., Teller, C., and Colón-Ramos, U. (2014). The burden of underweight and overweight among women in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health*, **1**4(1), pp.1–11.

Torabi, M., Datta, G.S. and Rao, J.N.K.(2009) Empirical Bayes estimation of small area means under nested error linear regression model with measurement error in the covariates. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **36**, 355–368.

Ybarra, L.M.R. and Lohr, S.L.(2008) Small area estimation when auxiliary information is measured with error. *Biometrika*, **95(4)**, 919–931.

Table 3: Simulation study: for each area, the table reports the RMSEs (multiplied by 100) of the small area mean θ_i (first line) and the credible interval coverage (second line) for the three models considered. All the quantities are averaged over 50 datasets

	$p = 0.5$			$p = 0.6$			$p = 0.7$			$p = 0.8$		
	M_{true}	M_{Prop}	M_{Naive}	M_{True}	M_{Prop}	M_{Naive}	M_{True}	M_{Prop}	M_{Naive}	M_{True}	M_{Prop}	M_{Naive}
1	0.71	5.92	26.99	0.03	0.56	3.22	0.05	0.65	2.67	0.16	0.18	6.79
	0.93	0.86	0.17	0.97	0.83	0.30	0.94	0.90	0.29	0.94	0.91	0.36
2	0.20	1.09	7.87	0.07	1.01	6.34	0.06	0.55	3.30	0.04	0.52	2.78
	0.97	0.84	0.22	0.89	0.81	0.21	0.92	0.87	0.30	0.98	0.89	0.45
3	0.06	0.69	3.81	0.10	1.83	6.36	0.06	0.98	4.18	0.10	0.69	7.55
	0.97	0.90	0.26	0.97	0.88	0.27	0.99	0.93	0.26	0.98	0.90	0.50
4	0.16	4.23	16.11	0.04	0.50	2.61	0.26	1.83	8.27	0.07	0.06	3.22
	0.96	0.89	0.17	0.96	0.84	0.31	0.82	0.75	0.25	0.96	0.94	0.36
5	0.11	0.96	3.53	0.09	0.67	4.80	0.10	0.64	2.29	0.12	0.22	6.15
	0.87	0.87	0.22	0.89	0.78	0.26	0.92	0.91	0.31	0.97	0.94	0.37
6	0.06	0.62	4.17	0.12	1.81	5.75	0.05	0.70	2.79	0.47	0.53	14.64
	0.91	0.84	0.24	0.99	0.88	0.27	0.95	0.88	0.29	0.95	0.86	0.32
7	0.13	2.65	9.86	0.05	0.62	2.99	0.04	0.54	2.62	0.11	0.10	3.48
	1.00	0.92	0.22	1.00	0.86	0.32	0.97	0.92	0.31	0.87	0.81	0.38
8	0.05	0.91	3.61	0.38	0.91	3.31	0.02	0.88	2.99	0.20	0.60	1.35
	0.95	0.89	0.21	0.98	0.84	0.24	0.91	0.81	0.30	0.87	0.85	0.55
9	0.04	0.70	3.05	0.02	1.05	3.03	0.14	1.20	4.87	0.16	0.18	8.13
	0.98	0.86	0.20	0.99	0.86	0.29	0.93	0.93	0.29	0.96	0.91	0.37
10	0.08	0.21	2.95	0.06	0.26	3.26	0.06	0.23	2.38	0.16	0.11	6.90
	0.82	0.72	0.19	0.97	0.85	0.23	0.96	0.88	0.23	0.99	0.94	0.30
11	0.08	1.58	4.62	0.02	0.87	3.45	0.07	2.74	11.08	0.06	0.58	2.22
	1.00	0.86	0.19	1.00	0.87	0.37	0.97	0.86	0.29	0.93	0.85	0.26
12	0.33	2.09	7.44	0.04	1.02	3.73	0.06	0.70	4.08	0.07	0.33	1.79
	0.90	0.81	0.19	1.00	0.87	0.33	1.00	0.89	0.23	0.88	0.89	0.44
13	0.06	0.80	3.29	0.55	4.23	15.47	0.20	2.82	9.13	0.03	0.02	2.57
	0.95	0.84	0.28	0.94	0.83	0.29	0.94	0.88	0.29	1.00	0.93	0.40
14	0.11	0.63	5.60	0.06	0.89	3.04	0.25	0.83	8.74	0.05	0.34	3.02
	0.85	0.85	0.17	1.00	0.86	0.34	0.84	0.84	0.29	1.00	0.91	0.53
15	0.04	0.70	4.57	0.03	0.73	2.79	0.10	0.41	4.40	0.05	0.08	2.04
	0.95	0.89	0.26	0.95	0.82	0.35	0.95	0.89	0.35	0.98	0.95	0.45
16	0.40	4.12	15.78	0.06	0.60	3.61	0.05	0.50	3.71	0.29	2.28	7.86
	1.00	0.90	0.20	0.93	0.79	0.29	0.96	0.91	0.32	0.97	0.95	0.38
17	0.14	2.67	7.93	0.05	2.03	3.49	0.03	0.74	3.27	0.27	1.64	5.20
	1.00	0.87	0.16	1.00	0.85	0.32	1.00	0.93	0.31	0.98	0.91	0.36
18	0.09	0.61	3.46	0.56	1.47	14.83	0.32	1.56	8.96	0.05	0.06	3.69
	0.92	0.84	0.21	0.81	0.74	0.17	0.90	0.89	0.25	0.90	0.91	0.46
19	0.17	0.59	3.92	0.15	0.58	3.26	0.11	0.60	2.40	0.11	0.29	3.57
	0.90	0.90	0.22	0.86	0.76	0.28	0.94	0.93	0.35	0.83	0.83	0.47
20	0.39	5.15	19.39	0.89	7.45	37.55	0.07	0.96	3.19	0.04	0.04	2.25
	0.98	0.92	0.19	0.83	0.74	0.21	1.00	0.89	0.31	1.00	0.94	0.43